

Approved Minutes of the Technical Advisory Committee Meeting  
September 16, 2003

<b>Members Present:</b>	Roger Thompson	Rodney Pingree
	John Forcier	Steve Revell
	Spencer Harris	Dave Cotton
	Allison Lowry	Gail Center
	Kim Crosby	Barb Willis
	Phil Dechert	Alan Huizenga

**Others Present:** Frank O'Brien

**Scheduled Meetings:**

October 14, 2003	1-4 PM	Mad Tom Room
November 18, 2003	1-4 PM	Skylight Conference Room
December 9, 2003	1-4 PM	St. Leo's Hall

**Review of Agenda:**

The proposed agenda was reviewed and it was decided to add a topic on the status of the rule revisions and to move the discussion related to the replacement areas for improved lot subdivisions higher on the list.

**Review of Minutes:**

The minutes for the August 19, 2003 meeting were reviewed and accepted as drafted.

**Appeal to the Water Resources Board**

Roger did a quick review of the Lyons project. This is a result of the decision issued by the Commissioner's office related to the need for an installation certification. This decision was discussed at the August 19, 2003 meeting. The property owner has appealed the decision to the Water Resources Board asking that the decision be remanded to the Commissioner's Office so that testimony and legal arguments can be offered.

**Status of Rule Revisions:**

Steve said that he wanted to keep the pressure on and get the rules moving forward. He is getting questions about why there has not been more progress. Roger said that the difficulties with Anne being out some and very overloaded continue but that he expected to start working some weekends in October to try and move things along.

Dave asked about whether we would consider making changes related to the requirements for separation between the bottom of filtrate effluent systems and the

seasonal high water table. This was discussed at earlier meetings and it was decided to limit the current proposal to changes for site technicians and delegation. There was a short discussion of “housekeeping” changes and Roger handed out his list of issues that needed attention.

### **Leaching Chambers**

Frank gave an overview of the issues. The Infiltrator vendors have asked for a reduction in size based on information that they believe shows a “shadowing” effect of crushed stone. Because their system does not use stone they think there is more effective infiltration area and therefore a smaller system would be equivalent.

There was a lot of discussion about the need for distribution pipe in chamber systems that receive effluent by gravity flow. Dave noted that once the bottom is covered in either a chamber system or a pipe and stone system, there is little flow through the biomat into the soil and therefore most of the flow is through the sidewalls. Several people noted that flow is not well distributed in systems using 4” diameter pipe with 5/8” holes but at the end of the discussion the view by a significant majority was that distribution pipe provides some benefit and because of the relatively low cost should be required.

Discussion turned back to the size issue, with John and Dave suggesting looking at what other states have done. Frank said he had checked some states and found that some gave the requested 50% reductions while others gave a fairly small reduction. The studies submitted by Infiltrator were discussed and there was a lot of skepticism as to whether the studies were appropriately done. There are questions as to whether overloading systems to try and duplicate long-term use really gives equivalent results. Frank said that one contact said that if shadowing occurred there should be clean soil under the pieces of aggregate but that inspection of failed systems did not find this result. TAC members agreed that they had not seen any evidence of the shadow effect in their fieldwork.

Roger noted that one way to approach this would be to pilot it. A significant number of systems could be installed, with room for a full sized system reserved in case there are any problems.

Barb said that she had approved some chambers several years ago and would try to check the records in that town to see if there was any information about how they were working.

There was no decision as to whether the TAC would support a reduction in area for leaching chambers.

### **Replacement areas for improved lot subdivision-**

Roger circulated a draft document outlining a possible approach. There was some discussion about how defined the replacement area should be, with most feeling that it should be more defined than just a box on the plans that included all of the available replacement area. Even though there would be some more cost in some cases, most thought leaving it so vague could penalize adjacent property owners who would be required to protect a larger area than needed for the replacement system. Spencer was concerned that the rules require people to identify extremely large systems, maybe 800' long, that are totally impractical.

Roger will revise the memo for the next meeting.

**Next meetings-**

It was decided to meet from 1-4 PM on November 18 and December 9 in addition to the meeting already scheduled for October 14.